[1st April 1930

## Inland Waterways

*Boat traffic in the Buckingham Canal.*

*1703 Q.—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) what the total length is of the Buckingham Canal and how much of it is fit for boat traffic to the north and south of Madras;

(b) the total number of boats licensed to use the canal and the number for the north section and that for the south section;

(c) the maximum and minimum loads the boats can carry in the Buckingham Canal;

(d) the regulation or rule, if any, according to which the Government are bound to maintain a specified depth of water in the canal and, if so, what the depth is and the action, if any, taken by the Government whenever the water fell below that level;

(e) whether the Government are aware that in the months of May, June and July, boats with only a load of half their normal capacity take a number of weeks to sail a distance of 50 or 60 miles;

(f) the reasons which led the Government to increase the licence fees of boats by 150 per cent distributing the increase over three years;

(g) the income to Government from the Buckingham Canal for the past ten years under (1) licence fees, (2) wharfage, (3) ground-rent, etc.;

(h) the expenditure on silt clearance every year for the past ten years;

(i) the depth of water in the canal in September and October 1929;

(j) the total amount of money paid to contractors for silt cleared during the months of September and October 1929 and whether, owing to the rains, the canal was full of water at the time;

(k) whether boat-men drew the attention of the Government or any of their Engineers to the fact that the low level of the iron bridge constructed by Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway Company at Elephant Gate recently did not permit covered boats to sail under it;

(l) whether the situation of cement bridge recently constructed by Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway Company at Elephant Gate with reference to the course of the stream under it is such as to obstruct the free passage of boats across it; and

(m) whether Government are prepared to hand over the canal to private enterprise with sufficient safeguards to ensure the proper maintenance of the canal and, if not, why not?

A.—(a) Two hundred and sixty-two miles. The Government are not aware that any part of it is unfit for boat traffic.

(b) About 4,000 according to the statistics of 1927–28. Later figures are not available; nor are separate figures for sections available.

(c) The Government have not the information.

(d) There is no such regulation or rule.

(e) The Government are not aware that the facts are as stated.

(f) The object was to obtain a return on the large amount to be spent on improvements.

(g) The information is given in statement D-I appended to the annual Irrigation Administration reports.

1st April 1930]

(h) This is included under maintenance charges which are also given in the same statement.

(i) & (j) The Government have not the information.

(k) & (l) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to question No. 1607 delivered on 20th March 1930.

(m) The Government have received no practicable offer of private enterprise.

## Irrigation

*Pumping of water for irrigation from wells near Kattangal spring.*

* 1704 Q.—Mr. M. BALASUBRAHMANYA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that in 1927 the officers of the Corporation of Madras went to inspect the Kattangal perennial spring which is the chief tributary to the Red Hills upper supply channel;

(b) whether they were satisfied that the said spring if properly preserved could supply ten million gallons of water every day to the City of Madras;

(c) whether after the said inspection some of the ryots of the Vishnuvakkam, Velapakkam and Kilanur villages have dug new wells adjacent to the Kattangal tributary and to the Cortaliar river and put up oil engines and are pumping out and selling water to the adjoining villages at Rs. 40 per acre per crop;

(d) whether a large extent of dry lands has thus been cultivated with wet crop;

(e) whether the Collector of Chingleput and the Executive Engineer, Chingleput division, inspected the said locality in September and October 1929 and ordered that the pumping should be forthwith discontinued;

(f) whether the water thus pumped out was taken through Government poramboke channels without Government permission; and

(g) if the answer to (d), (e) and (f) be in the affirmative, what steps have been taken by the Government to put an end to these irregularities?

A.—(a) to (g) The Government have no information, but have called for a report.

Mr. M. BALASUBRAHMANYA MUDALIYAR:—"May I ask the hon. the Revenue Member whether he will be pleased to lay the report on the table of the House when it is received?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"I will consider the suggestion."

*Investigation of the Kiripatti Reservoir scheme.*

* 1705 Q.—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the investigation of the Kiripatti Reservoir scheme in the district of Salem has been completed, and whether a report of the same will be placed on the table of the House;

(b) whether plans and estimates have been called for and received by the Government with reference to the said scheme;